UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/032,252	12/21/2001	Peter V. Radatti	CSI-02	6644

7590 10/21/2005

Peter V. Radatti, Esquire
CyberSoft, Inc.
1508 Butler Pike
Conshocken, PA 19428

EXAMINER	
ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2165	

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/032,252	RADATTI, PETER V.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Neveen Abel-Jalil	2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 July 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,12-16 and 18-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,12-16 and 18-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 25-July-2005 has been entered.

2. The amendment filed on 285-July-2005 has been received and entered. Claims 10, 11, and 17 have been cancelled. Claim 27 has been newly added. Therefore, claims 1-9, 12-16, and 18-27 are now pending.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 14, line 1, the recitation of "in claim 11" should be deleted. The dependency of Claim 14 has been changed to be dependent on claim 27 instead of 11. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-9, 12-16, and 18-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Satyanarayanan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,662,198 B2).

As to claims 1, and 18, Satyanarayanan et al. discloses a method for securing, maintaining, monitoring and controlling computer files comprising:

providing a first data file, comprised of at least one first data file file name as well as a first data file hash value, wherein said data file hash file is comprised of the contents of each file referred to by each of said first data file file names (See column 19, lines 1-6, also see column 24, lines 30-64);

providing a second data file, comprised of at least one second data file file name (See column 6, lines 1-39, prior art);

comparing said second data file to said first data file in a comparison cycle, wherein said comparison cycle further comprises (See column 15, lines 1-23, also see column 15, lines 48-67).;

obtaining each file referred to by each of said second data file file names (See column 9, lines 13-35);

generating a second data file hash value, wherein said data file hash file is comprised of the contents is each file referred to by each of said second data file file names (See column 14, lines 1-19);

sending each second data file hash value and each second data file file name to a comparison component (See column 13, lines 57-65, also see column 19, lines 1-6, also see column 24, lines 30-64).

As to claim 2, Satyanarayanan et al. discloses further comprising repeating the steps of:

obtaining each file referred to by each of said second data file file names (See column 13, lines 1-32);

generating a second data file hash value for each file referred to by each of said second data file file names (See column 19, lines 1-6, also see column 24, lines 30-64);

sending each second data file hash value and each second data file file name to a comparison component (See column 13, lines 57-65).

As to claims 3, and 19, Satyanarayanan et al. discloses further comprising the step of:

comparing each second data file hash value to each first data file hash value (See column 20, lines 38-50, also see column 13, lines 57-65).

As to claims 4, and 20, Satyanarayanan et al. discloses wherein the step of providing a first data file further comprises proving a secure system data file (See column 19, lines 1-6, also see column 24, lines 30-64).

As to claims 5, and 21, Satyanarayanan et al. discloses wherein the step of providing a first data file further comprises proving an alternate data file (See column 19, lines 1-6, also see

column 24, lines 30-64).

As to claims 6, 12, and 22, Satyanarayanan et al. discloses further comprising the step of reporting the results of said comparison cycle See column 20, lines 38-50).

As to claims 7, 13, and 23, Satyanarayanan et al. discloses further comprising the step of logging the results of said comparison cycle See column 20, lines 38-50).

As to claims 8, 15, and 24, Satyanarayanan et al. discloses further comprising the step of sending the results of said comparison cycle to a client comparison status mechanism (See column 20, lines 38-50).

As to claims 9, 16, and 25, 26, Satyanarayanan et al. discloses wherein the step of generating a first data file further comprises using a Loop Back mechanism to generate said first data file (See column 16, lines 1-19).

As to claim 14, Satyanarayanan et al. discloses comprising the step of securing a system in lock down mode (See column 15, lines 25-34, wherein "lock down" reads on "will not be updated, deleted, or in anyway changed").

As to claim 27, Satyanarayanan et al. discloses a method for securing computer files comprising:

generating a secure system file, further comprising creating a first hash value for a file, wherein said hash value is comprised of the content of said file, and arranging said hash value with its respective file's name (See column 19, lines 1-6, also see column 24, lines 30-64);

sorting said secure system file (See column 15, lines 25-34, wherein "sorting" reads on "look-up"); and

comparing said secure system file to a comparison file in a comparison cycle, wherein said comparison file further comprises at least a second file, and wherein said comparison cycle further comprises hashing the contents of said second file, and thereby obtaining a second hash value, and sending said second hash value and its respective file's name to a comparison component, whereby said second file hash value is compared to said first file hash value (See column 15, lines 1-23, also see column 15, lines 48-67).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9, 12-16, and 18-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Eldridge et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,787,169) teaches two hash tables.

Platt (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0028761 A1) teaches hashing both file name and content.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neveen Abel-Jalil whose telephone number is 571-272-4074. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5: 30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Neveen Abel-Jalil
October 17, 2005

CHARLES RONES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER